



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,138	12/12/2003	William M. Quinn	LOT920050095US1_005	1935
51835	7590	12/03/2010	EXAMINER	
IBM LOTUS & RATIONAL SW c/o GUERIN & RODRIGUEZ 5 MOUNT ROYAL AVENUE MOUNT ROYAL OFFICE PARK MARLBOROUGH, MA 01752			JOO, JOSHUA	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2445		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/03/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/735,138	QUINN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOSHUA JOO	2445	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2010.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Detailed Action

This Office action is in response to Applicant's communication filed on May 5, 2010.

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 5, 2010 has been entered.

Response to Arguments/Remarks

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. New ground(s) of rejection are necessitated by Applicant's amendment. Therefore, claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-14, 16-24 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal et al. US Publication No. 2003/0014488, in view of von Kaenel et al. US Publication No. 2004/0117358 and Blevins, US Patent No. 7,627,631.

Applicant also remarked that claim 21 has been amended to recite "computer readable storage medium" and submits that the amendment overcomes the rejection.

In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees that the amendment overcomes the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of the claims. The instant specification does not limit a medium to only statutory embodiments. Based on the broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification, the computer-readable storage medium could still be interpreted as a medium, e.g.

signal, that holds or stores program. Transitory medium has been held to be non-statutory and therefore the computer program product could be directed to only non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Objections

Objections to claims 22-23 are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 21, Applicant is seeking to patent a "computer program product comprising a computer-readable storage medium". The term "computer-readable storage medium" could include signals in transmission which have been held to be non-statutory, e.g. a signal holding or storing a program during transmission. The computer program product does not require any functional hardware and thus could be directed to only a non-statutory subject matter. It is suggested that Applicant amend the claims to recite "non-transitory computer readable storage medium" or add functional hardware such as memory to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The suggested amendment will not be considered as "new matter".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-14, 16-23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal et al. US Publication No. 2003/0014488 (Dalal hereinafter), in view of von Kaenel et al. US Publication No. 2004/0117358 (von Kaenel hereinafter) and Blevins, US Patent No. 7,627,631 (Blevins hereinafter).

As per claim 1, Dalal teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a method comprising:

providing a service provider interface (SPI) defining a plurality of procedures for communicating with a meeting services application of the online meeting system (Paragraph 0022. Conference service provider. Paragraphs 0036; 0040; 0043. Execute operations such as authorizing, creating and deleting a conference, invite participants.);

implementing one of the procedures of the SPI in a software module, the software module performing, when executed, a meeting-related operation customized in accordance with the system (Paragraph 0036; 0040. Operations to authorize user, create, or delete a conference.); and

receiving, from the meeting services application, a call to the implemented SPI procedure of the installed software module to perform the meeting-related operation, thereby integrating the meeting-related operation into the online meeting system (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize user, create or delete a conference.).

Dalal does not specifically teach that the software module is a third-party software module of a third-party system, the third party software module perform a meeting related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system; and integrating the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting

Art Unit: 2445

system. Dalal does not specifically teach installing the third-party software module as a plug-in to the meeting services application.

Von Kaenel teaches a third-party software module of a third-party system, the third party module perform a meeting related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system; and integrating the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting system (Paragraphs 0263, 0467-470. Collaboration. Paragraph 0265; 1227. API to third party applications).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to implement a third party module to perform meeting related operation customized in accordance with a third party system and integrate the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting system. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Von Kaenel's teachings would improve Dalal's teachings by enabling delegation of services to third party applications and enabling integration of third party services to accomplish necessary or help tasks.

Blevins teaches of installing a third-party software module of a third-party system as a plug-in to a meeting services application, wherein the third party software module performs a meeting related operation customized in accordance with a third-party system (col. 2, line 64-col. 3, line 12; col. 14, line 1-4. Plug-in by a third party for operations. col. 3, lines 56-59, col. 6, lines 34-42; col. 18, lines 48-61; col. 19, lines 51-62. Plug-in for messaging, creating collaborative workflows.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to install a third-party software module of a third-party system as a plug-in to a meeting services application. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Blevin's teachings would improve the suggested system by providing

seamless integration with external products and technologies and plug-ins would allow simple extension to the functionality of the system.

As per claim 11, Dalal teaches substantially the invention as claimed including an online meeting system, comprising a server system having memory for storing program code and a processor for executing the program code, the program code including:

a meeting service application for providing online meeting services for users communicating with the online meeting system over a network connection (Paragraph 0022. Conference service provider. Paragraphs 0036; 0040; 0043. Execute operations such as authorizing, creating and deleting a conference, invite participants.);

a service provider interface (SPI) defining a plurality of procedures for communicating with the meeting services application (Paragraph 0036; 0040. Operations to authorize user, create, or delete a conference.); and

a software module implementing one of the procedures of the SPI to perform a meeting-related operation customized in accordance with a system when the procedure is called by the meeting service application (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize user, create or delete a conference.).

Dalal does not specifically teach of a third-party software module of a third-party system, the third-party software module being installed in the memory as a plug-in to the meeting services application.

Von Kaenel teaches a third-party software module of a third-party system (Paragraphs 0263, 0467-470. Collaboration. Paragraph 0265; 1227. API to third party applications.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to implement a third party module of a third party system. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Von Kaenel's teachings would improve

Dalal's teachings by enabling delegation of services to third party applications and enabling integration of third party services to accomplish necessary or help tasks.

Blevins teaches of installing a third-party software module of a third-party system as a plug-in to a meeting services application, wherein the third party software module performs a meeting related operation customized in accordance with a third-party system (col. 2, line 64-col. 3, line 12; col. 14, line 1-4. Plug-in by a third party for operations. col. 3, lines 56-59, col. 6, lines 34-42; col. 18, lines 48-61; col. 19, lines 51-62. Plug-in for messaging, creating collaborative workflows.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to install a third-party software module of a third-party system as a plug-in to a meeting services application. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Blevin's teachings would improve the suggested system by providing seamless integration with external products and technologies and plug-ins would allow simple extension to the functionality of the system.

As per claim 17, Dalal teaches substantially the invention as claimed including an apparatus for integrating a system with an online meeting system, the apparatus comprising:

means for providing a service provider interface (SPI) defining a plurality of procedures for communicating with a meeting services application of the online meeting system (Paragraph 0022. Conference service provider. Paragraphs 0036; 0040; 0043. Execute operations such as authorizing, creating and deleting a conference, invite participants.);

means for implementing one of the procedures of the SPI by a software module to perform, when executed, a meeting-related operation customized in accordance with the system (Paragraph 0036; 0040. Operations to authorize user, create, or delete a conference.); and

means for calling by the meeting service application the implemented SPI procedure of the software module to perform the meeting-related operation (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize user, create or delete a conference.).

Dalal does not specifically teach that the software module is a third-party software module of the third-party system, the third party software module perform a meeting related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system; and integrating the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting system, the third-party software module being installed as a plug-in to the meeting services application.

Von Kaenel teaches a third-party software module of the third-party system, the third party module perform a meeting related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system; and integrating the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting system (Paragraphs 0263, 0467-470. Collaboration. Paragraph 0265; 1227. API to third party applications.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to implement a third party module to perform meeting related operation customized in accordance with a third party system and integrate the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting system. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Von Kaenel's teachings would improve Dalal's teachings by enabling delegation of services to third party applications and enabling integration of third party services to accomplish necessary or help tasks.

Blevins teaches of installing a third-party software module of a third-party system as a plug-in to a meeting services application, wherein the third party software module performs a meeting related operation customized in accordance with a third-party system (col. 2, line 64-col. 3, line 12; col. 14, line 1-4. Plug-in by a third party for operations. col. 3, lines 56-59, col. 6,

lines 34-42; col. 18, lines 48-61; col. 19, lines 51-62. Plug-in for messaging, creating collaborative workflows.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to install a third-party software module of a third-party system as a plug-in to a meeting services application. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Blevin's teachings would improve the suggested system by providing seamless integration with external products and technologies and plug-ins would allow simple extension to the functionality of the system.

As per claim 21, Dalal teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a computer program product for use with a computer system, the computer program product comprising a computer useable medium having embodied therein program code comprising:

program code for providing a service provider interface (SPI) defining a plurality of procedures for communicating with a meeting services application of the online meeting system (Paragraph 0022. Conference service provider. Paragraphs 0036; 0040; 0043. Execute operations such as authorizing, creating and deleting a conference, invite participants.);

program code for implementing one of the procedures of the SPI by a software module to perform, when executed, a meeting-related operation customized in accordance with the system (Paragraph 0036; 0040. Operations to authorize user, create, or delete a conference.); and

program code for calling by the meeting service application the implemented SPI procedure of the software module to perform the meeting-related operation (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize user, create or delete a conference.).

Dalal does not specifically teach that the software module is a third-party software module of the third-party system, the third party software module perform a meeting related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system; and integrating the meeting-

related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting system, the third-party software module being installed as a plug-in to the meeting services application.

Von Kaenel teaches a third-party software module of the third-party system, the third party module perform a meeting related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system; and integrating the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting system (Paragraphs 0263, 0467-470. Collaboration. Paragraph 0265; 1227. API to third party applications.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to implement a third party module to perform meeting related operation customized in accordance with a third party system and integrate the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting system. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Von Kaenel's teachings would improve Dalal's teachings by enabling delegation of services to third party applications and enabling integration of third party services to accomplish necessary or help tasks.

Blevins teaches of installing a third-party software module of a third-party system as a plug-in to a meeting services application, wherein the third party software module performs a meeting related operation customized in accordance with a third-party system (col. 2, line 64-col. 3, line 12; col. 14, line 1-4. Plug-in by a third party for operations. col. 3, lines 56-59, col. 6, lines 34-42; col. 18, lines 48-61; col. 19, lines 51-62. Plug-in for messaging, creating collaborative workflows.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to install a third-party software module of a third-party system as a plug-in to a meeting services application. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Blevin's teachings would improve the suggested system by providing

seamless integration with external products and technologies and plug-ins would allow simple extension to the functionality of the system.

As per claim 2, Dalal, Von Kaenel, and Blevins teach the method of claim 1. Dalal teaches wherein the called SPI procedure notifies the software module of a proposed transaction of an event in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation before the event occurs (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize before creating or deleting a conference.).

As per claim 3, Dalal teaches the method of claim 2, further comprising prohibiting the occurrence of the event in response to performing the meeting related operation implemented by the called SPI procedure (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. User not authorized to create or delete a conference.).

As per claim 5, Dalal teaches the method of claim 2, further comprising modifying meeting-related information associated with the proposed transaction of an event in response to performing the meeting-related operation implemented by the called SPI procedure (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Create or delete a conference.).

As per claim 6, Dalal, Von Kaenel, and Blevins teach the method of claim 1. Dalal teaches wherein the called SPI procedure notifies the software module of an event that has occurred in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting related operation in response to the occurrence of that event (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize user. Create or delete a conference.).

As per claim 8, Dalal, Von Kaenel, and Blevins teach the method of claim 1. Dalal teaches wherein the call to the implemented SPI procedure occurs in response to receiving a user request to create, edit, or delete a meeting (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Receive request to create or delete a conference. Determine whether user is authorized to create or delete a conference.).

As per claim 9, Dalal, Von Kaenel, and Blevins teach the method of claim 1. Dalal teaches wherein the call to the implemented SPI procedure occurs in response to detecting a state change of a running meeting (Paragraph 0065; 0068. Perform operation in response to request to join or leave a conference.).

As per claim 10, Dalal, Von Kaenel, and Blevins teach the method of claim 1. Dalal teaches the method further comprising defining a first class that implements the SPI and a second class that extends the first class and implements the called SPI procedure that performs the customized meeting-related operation (Paragraphs 0040; 0048; 0054. SPMS performs operation in response to event received by SPCC.).

As per claim 12, Dalal, Von Kaenel, and Blevins teach the online meeting system of claim 11. Dalal teaches wherein the implemented SPI procedure, when called, notifies the software module of a proposed transaction of an event in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation before the event occurs (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize before creating or deleting a conference.).

As per claim 13, Dalal teaches the online meeting system of claim 12, wherein the implemented SPI procedure includes program code for throwing an exception to prohibit the occurrence of the event in response to performing the meeting-related operation (Paragraphs

0036; 0040. Determine whether or not user is authorized to perform request.).

As per claim 14, Dalal, Von Kaenel, and Blevins teach the online meeting system of claim 11. Dalal teaches wherein the called SPI procedure notifies the software module of an event that has occurred in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation in response to the occurrence of that event (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Creating or Delete a conference.).

As per claim 16, Dalal, Von Kaenel, and Blevins teach the online meeting system of claim 11. Dalal teaches the system further comprising program code defining a first class that implements the plurality of procedures of the SPI and a second class that extends the first class and provides a customized implementation of one of the SPI procedures defined in the first class (Paragraphs 0040; 0048; 0054. SPMS performs operation in response to event received by SPCC.).

As per claim 18, Dalal, Von Kaenel, and Blevins teach the apparatus of claim 17. Dalal teaches wherein the means for receiving the call to the implemented SPI procedure includes means for notifying the software module of a proposed transaction of an event in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation before the event occurs (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize before creating or deleting a conference.).

As per claim 19, Dalal teaches the apparatus of claim 18, wherein the means for receiving the call to the implemented SPI procedure includes means for prohibiting the occurrence of the event in response to performing the meeting-related operation (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Determine whether or not user is authorized to perform request.).

As per claim 20, Dalal, Von Kaenel, and Blevins teach the apparatus of claim 17. Dalal teaches the apparatus further comprising means for defining a first class that implements the plurality of procedures of the SPI and a second class that extends the first class and provides a customized implementation of one of the SPI procedures defined in the first class (Paragraphs 0040; 0048; 0054. SPMS performs operation in response to event received by SPCC.).

As per claim 22, Dalal, Von Kaenel, and Blevins teach the computer program product of claim 21. Dalal teaches wherein the program code for receiving the call to the implemented SPI procedure includes program code for notifying the software module of a proposed transaction of an event in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation before the event occurs (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize before creating or deleting a conference.).

As per claim 23, Dalal teaches the computer program product of claim 22, wherein the program code for receiving the call to the implemented SPI procedure includes program code for prohibiting the occurrence of the event in response to performing the meeting-related operation (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Determine whether or not user is authorized to perform request.).

As per claim 24, Dalal, Von Kaenel, and Blevins teach the computer program product of claim 21. Dalal teaches the product further comprising program code for defining a first class that implements the plurality of procedures of the SPI and a second class that extends the first class and provides a customized implementation of one of the SPI procedures defined in the first class (Paragraphs 0040; 0048; 0054. SPMS performs operation in response to event received by SPCC.).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal, in view of von Kaenel, Blevins, and Krishnaswamy et al. US Patent No. 6,909,708 (Krishnaswamy hereinafter).

As per claim 4, Dalal suggests of prohibiting the event (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Check whether or not user is authorized.). Dalal does not specifically teach the method of claim 3, further comprising redirecting by the called SPI procedure a user of the online meeting system to an error page in response to prohibiting the event.

Krishnaswamy teaches of redirecting a user of an online meeting system to an error page in response to prohibiting the event (col. 61, lines 36-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to redirect a user of an online meeting system to an error page in response to prohibiting the event, which would improve user-friendliness of the suggested system by enabling a user to be notified of the prohibited event.

Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal, in view of von Kaenel, Blevins, and Nakajima, US Patent No. 6,289,510 (Nakajima hereinafter).

As per claim 7, Dalal does not specifically teach the method of claim 1, further comprising installing a new software module that implements one of the SPI procedures, and dynamically integrating the new software module to the meeting services application without stopping the online meeting system.

Nakajima teaches of installing a new software module and dynamically integrating the new software module to a services application without stopping the online system (col. 5, lines 6-11; col. 13, lines 14-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the one of the SPI procedures as taught by Dalal to be implemented by installing a new software module and dynamically integrating the new software module to the services application without stopping the meeting system as taught by Nakajima. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Nakajima's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling addition of software without interrupting services (col. 2, lines 26-30)

As per claim 15, Dalal does not specifically teach the online meeting system of claim 11, wherein the server system includes a means of storing software modules to be integrated in the online meeting system, and wherein the meeting services application periodically accesses the storage means to install dynamically any software module newly added to the storage means without stopping the online meeting system.

Nakajima teaches of a system that includes a means of storing software modules to be integrated in an online system, and wherein the meeting services application accesses the storage means to install dynamically any software module newly added to the storage means without stopping the online meeting system (col. 5, lines 6-11; col. 13, lines 14-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the one of the SPI procedures as taught by Dalal to be implemented by installing a new software module and dynamically integrating the new software module to the services application without stopping the meeting system as taught by Nakajima. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Nakajima's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling addition of software without interrupting services (col. 2, lines 26-30). Although Nakajima teaches of accessing the storage means but not specifically periodically, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to request or obtain updated

software from time to time in order to ensure that the system is operating with updated or newer software.

Conclusion

Examiner has cited particular sections of the reference(s) that are applied to the claims. While the sections are cited for convenience and are representative of the teachings of the prior art, other sections of the reference(s) may be relevant and applicable to the claims. It is respectfully requested that Applicant fully consider the reference(s) in its entirety when responding to the Office action.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30AM to 4:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew T. Caldwell can be reached on 571 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Joshua Joo/
Examiner, Art Unit 2445